

1 FABIO MARINO (STATE BAR NO. 183825)  
fmarino@orrick.com  
2 DENISE MINGRONE (STATE BAR NO. 135224)  
dmingrone@orrick.com  
3 SIDDHARTHA VENKATESAN (STATE BAR NO. 245008)  
svenkatesan@orrick.com  
4 CHRISTINA VON DER AHE (STATE BAR NO. 255467)  
cvonderahe@orrick.com  
5 NITIN GAMBHIR (STATE BAR NO. 259906)  
ngambhir@orrick.com  
6 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
1000 Marsh Road  
7 Menlo Park, California 94025  
Telephone: 650-614-7400  
8 Facsimile: 650-614-7401

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterclaim Defendants  
10 BROCADE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS, INC. AND  
FOUNDRY NETWORKS, LLC

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
13 SAN JOSE DIVISION

14 BROCADE COMMUNICATIONS  
SYSTEMS, INC., a Delaware corporation, and  
15 FOUNDRY NETWORKS, LLC, a Delaware  
limited liability company,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 A10 NETWORKS, INC., a California  
corporation; LEE CHEN, an individual;  
19 RAJKUMAR JALAN; an individual; RON  
SZETO, an individual; DAVID CHEUNG, an  
20 individual; LIANG HAN, an individual; and  
STEVEN HWANG, an individual,

21 Defendants.

22 A10 NETWORKS, INC., a California  
corporation,

23 Counterclaim-Plaintiff,

24 v.

25 BROCADE COMMUNICATIONS  
SYSTEMS, INC., a Delaware corporation, and  
26 FOUNDRY NETWORKS, LLC, a Delaware  
limited liability company,

27 Counterclaim-Defendants.  
28

Case No. 10-cv-03428 LHK

**ORDER GRANTING, in part,  
BROCADE COMMUNICATIONS  
SYSTEMS, INC.'S AND FOUNDRY  
NETWORKS, LLC'S  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR  
LEAVE TO FILE *UNDER SEAL*  
SUBMISSION OF ATTORNEYS' FEES  
AND COSTS PURSUANT TO COURT  
ORDER**

Date: August 30, 2011  
Time: 11:00 am  
Dept: Courtroom 4, 5th Floor  
Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh

1 The Court, having considered Brocade Communications, Inc. and Foundry Networks  
2 LLC's ("Plaintiffs") administrative motion for leave to file under seal their Submission of  
3 Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to Court Order and having found good cause to do so, it is  
4 HEREBY ORDERED that said leave is GRANTED in part. However, Local Rule 79-5(a)  
5 requires that the request to seal must be "narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable  
6 material." While the Court finds that the itemized Orrick billing records are properly sealable  
7 because they contain confidential information, the Submission of Fees, as well as the attorney  
8 biographies do not contain confidential information.

9 If Plaintiffs believe the submission of fees and attorney biographies contain confidential  
10 information, they shall submit a declaration explaining why this information is sealable within 5  
11 days of the date of this Order. Otherwise, Plaintiffs' request is granted. To the extent that  
12 Plaintiffs' sealing motion is granted, Plaintiffs shall comply with G.O. 62 regarding electronic  
13 filing of the sealed information.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15  
16 Dated: September 6, 2011

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Honorable Lucy H. Koh  
United States District Court Judge